

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 14 2006

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 14, 2006. Claims 1-8 remain pending in this application. Claim 1 is the independent claim. Claims 1, 3, and 6 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

On the merits, the Office Action objected to the specification and the claims because of the listed informalities. Furthermore, the Office Action rejected Claims 3-7 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. The Office Action also rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Izumi (U.S. Patent No. 5,983,501; hereinafter "Izumi") in view of Kadijk et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0039734; hereinafter "Kadijk"). Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections for at least the following reasons.

In addition, Claims 2 and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Further, Claims 3-7 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant appreciates the Examiner pointing out allowable subject matter.

Applicant has amended the specification to address the informalities presented by the Examiner in the Office Action. In addition, Applicant has amended Claim 1 as suggested by the Examiner in order to address the claim objections. Because of these claim and specification amendments, Applicant now believes the claim and specification objections to be moot.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

The Office Action rejected Claims 3-7 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, the Examiner stated that the term "restrainers" and variations of such term lacked antecedent basis. Claims 3 and 6 have been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for Claims 3-7. Applicant now believes Claims 3-7 to have overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The Examiner rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Izumi in view of Kadijk. The Examiner stated that Izumi does not disclose two different shaving fields for cutting short and long hair but that Kadijk provided such limitation. But Izumi in view of Kadijk does not recite, suggest, teach, or render obvious all of the claim elements of Applicant's Claim 1. For instance, Izumi in view of Kadijk does not disclose a shaving apparatus wherein each "external cutting members is rotatable about an axis of rotation between at least two shaving positions" and "means for effecting rotation of each of said external cutting members between said at least two shaving positions." Izumi discloses an electric shaver wherein the "outer cutters are rotated by the motors at a slower rotation than the inner cutters." See Izumi, Abstract. The outer cutters 12 in Izumi rotate at a proportional speed of the inner cutters 40 through a system of gears. See *Id.*, Figure 4 and column 8, line 66 – column 9, line 5. But the outer cutters 12 in Izumi are constantly rotating along with the inner cutters 40 and do not allow for specific shaving positions for the outer cutters as recited in Applicant's Claim 1. Furthermore, Kadijk does not provide for rotation between at least two shaving positions through means for effecting rotation including a control member and without removing the cutting units from the shaving head. See Kadijk paragraph 26. Hence Izumi in view of Kadijk does not provide for external cutting members that are rotatable between at least two shaving positions with means for effecting such rotation as recited by Applicant's Claim 1. Therefore, Izumi in view of

Kadijk does not recite, suggest, teach, or render obvious all of the claim elements in Applicant's Claim 1.

Claims 2-8 depend from independent Claim 1 as discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Applicant further believes the §103(a) rejections of Claims 2-8 to be moot in light of the above remarks and request their withdrawal.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the currently pending claims are clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied references. Accordingly, entry of this amendment, reconsideration of the rejections of the claims over the references cited, and allowance of this application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By AA L St

Adam L. Stroud,
Reg. No. 48,410
Attorney
(408) 474-9064
December 14, 2006